



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

of one or two of the more important vowels would be a permanent relief.

Various reports of importance were submitted to the Association. Prof. Todd, of Columbia University, for the committee on Coöperative Bibliography, reported informally the prospective advance in this field, since the new educational gift by Carnegie contemplated offering an opportunity for definite work in bibliography.

The social side of the Association meeting was carefully provided for, and a spirit of heartiest good-fellowship prevailed throughout the convention. Thursday evening, President and Mrs. Eliot welcomed the members of the Association and ladies at their home on Quincy St. Over two hundred guests were present, and the reception by its informality offered a pleasant meeting-place for the visiting members. Friday and Saturday, luncheon was served in the Faculty Room in University Hall. After luncheon on Friday Miss Alice Longfellow opened her house for an informal reception, which gave the guests a much-prized opportunity of visiting the historical Craigie house. Later, from four to six, the members were received at the regular Friday afternoon tea given by the ladies of the Faculty in the Phillips Brooks House. Friday evening the reunion held at the Colonial Club was largely attended. Mr. Bliss Perry of the *Atlantic Monthly* gave an informal talk upon "The College Professor and the Public." Mr. Perry sketched the change which has taken place in the relations of the professor to the world in general. Formerly the professor was a student only, entirely separated from outside interests. Though the scholar must always voyage alone into some regions, and his very absentness means in the end great value to the world, yet a new type of college professor is developing—one which knows all about things. Familiarity with the world may destroy all the old traditional fastidiousness, but this familiarity is of advantage not alone to the public, which receives highly trained and intelligent coöperation, but to the professor himself.

In the political field, the professor is often earnestly and honestly active, but usually at the risk of accusations of fraud and bribery. Wider fields of activity—fields less open to

suspicion of unfairness—lie in the social movements for libraries, parks and better tenements. In these fields, the college professor can do the public his greatest service, and in such service alone does he find the noblest moments of life.

President Eliot spoke of Prof. Sophocles, and paid high tribute to Ezra Abbott as a retired scholar, who, in his very retirement, had given benefit to thousands of practical men of business by inventing the card-catalogue system.

Throughout the convention, the Colonial Club and the new Harvard Union extended their privileges to the visitors, and added not a little to the success of a meeting of which the characteristic features seemed to be cordial fellowship and scholarly work.

P. C. HOYT.

*Harvard University.*

### THE DEVELOPMENT OF TAINE CRITICISM SINCE 1893.

#### II.

AN article of especial interest on account of its broad, liberal, deep and appreciative interpretation of Taine's work, is that of Wetz, *Krit. Jhrbrt. Rom. Philol.*, 1. pp. 157-192, 1895. Wetz first presents the different methods of treating literary history, showing that Taine's system is a broader conception than Herder's. This is one of the clearest and most thorough presentations of Taine's system that we have. In the second part of his essay on Taine's position and significance in literary history, Wetz is the first German, as far as the writer is acquainted with German Taine critics, to give him his just merit. He has drawn, in an entirely new way, a knowledge of the intellectual personality of the author through his work, and he has done this by being the first to apply in his material the scientific method and precise language of psychology. He gives definite data on phantasy, intellect, ideas, feelings of an author, etc., thus offering a psychological explanation for every phenomenon. In the third part of the article we have a concise and terse statement of the difference between Taine's and Hennequin's systems of criticism.

An interesting and suggestive study of Taine

is found in *La Vie et les Livres*, II, G. Deschamps, pp. 99-189. Most ingeniously does this writer work out Taine's salient quality through the power of his exterior vision and intensity of his interior reflection. M. Deschamps becomes very impatient with Taine's great admiration of and preference for England, p. 113. His descriptions are thoroughly naturalistic, and on the deep-seated villainy of man Taine agrees with Zola and Maupassant; his sombre pessimism is even worse than that of Leopardi, pp. 116-117. This study offers many valuable observations, by way of *résumé*, of Taine's aim and purpose. No one has better defined his position in the literary movement of the nineteenth century; he is the natural culmination of it, from Chateaubriand to Loti, he has visited all the places and peoples, and written and thought about them as a Chateaubriand, Hugo, Gautier, Flaubert, but he has reasoned over his melancholy and reduced the *mal du siècle* to syllogisms; he recognized the cause of the incurable melancholy of which he had a vague sentiment—all this he has gathered, accumulated in facts and reasoned and formulated into laws; this is one of the most heroic efforts of human intelligence, pp. 179-180. No one has uttered a truer saying among Taine's critics than Deschamps when he said that it is easier to refute his doctrines than to avoid or escape their action.

Weigand. *Das Elend der Kritik*, 1895, München, pp. 35-101, is not generally known, but contains a great deal of information on Ste.-Beuve and Taine. He shows the importance and influence of birthplace and country on the development of the young Taine, pp. 36-39, the philosopher, pp. 39-40; the artist, pp. 49-54; and then discusses his productions in chronological order. According to Weigand, Taine trusts in himself too much for his material, and thus is hardly scientific enough. He quotes at length from Taine, and adds a few explanatory and critical remarks. Possibly the best part of this essay is that which treats of his philosophy of art. Weigand seems to have interpreted the spirit of Taine, the artist, better than any previous writer; an interesting attempt is made to prove that Taine's system has utterly failed in the description of Greek culture, which views would

hardly be accepted generally. Weigand is the first critic who believes that Hegel's influence upon him is often overestimated. So many critics refuse Taine his just portion of originality, maintaining that many of his ideas are derived from Hegel, Herder and Goethe; the general notion prevails that Taine is superficial and unreliable; not until 1895 with Barzellotti's work had this notion been generally abandoned. Credit must be given Wetz and Weigand for their farsightedness in considering Taine to be more than an ordinary figure. The following statement of Weigand is of importance in Taine criticism:

"He served his time; he did not break away from the traditions of the old French spirit; he widened the horizon of French culture and he is the best example to show how deeply the Germanic influence can touch a Latin without becoming dangerous to his nature."

The lectures delivered by Ed. Droz at Besançon on *La Critique Littéraire de Taine*, have been published by Lecène, Oudin, 1895, p. 39. Droz is not an admirer of Taine, but evidently of Ste.-Beuve; he speaks as a moralist and Taine's theory, according to him, excludes all notion of morality; this point of view runs through his entire lectures, and Wetz says it is doubtful whether Droz appreciates Taine as a philosopher, which view would seem true, after reading his essays. The writer has not had access to all of these lectures. In the study under discussion he simply tries to refute a number of Taine's statements which he has selected from his works. His whole theory of information is inadequate; first, on account of the impossibility of knowing all the existing historical documents of a period and the impossibility of these documents including all the life of a generation; secondly, on account of the absence in the moral sciences of precise instruments of valuation and measure, p. 23; hence, his method is only a programme and the results will be as different as the minds that use it. He absolutely denies any relation between a historical investigation and an experiment in physiology or chemistry. The methods are fundamentally different. The essay is of especial interest to a Taine student because it presents so many objections to his system and method, thus offering a splendid basis for a

critical study of Taine and his work. Whether the reader agrees with Droz, or not, will depend largely upon the attitude he has taken as to the relation of the natural and moral sciences.

A very valuable article for the Taine student is Wetz' second study in the *Zts. Spr. Litt.* xxi, 1899, pp. 114-251, giving a critical analysis of the studies of de Vogüé, Monod, Sorel, Margerie, Droz, de Broglie, Barzellotti, and Weigand. Wetz has come to the conclusion that Taine is one of the most difficult of modern writers fully to appreciate; few critics have judged him rightly in the *ensemble* of his work nearly all lacking a broad perspective necessary to an appreciation of such immense talent. Especially have the critics of his English Literature failed, seeing only the defects, the hasty work, the skillful compiler, but entirely overlooking the *ensemble*, the prodigious intellectual work of the author. Wetz discusses at length his life and works, pp. 114-138. An interesting comparison of the opinion of different critics on his style is presented, pp. 142-154, a general statement of which may be summed up as follows: In spite of the splendor and clearness of Taine's style in his descriptions of nature, he lacks soul; form and color are admirably developed, but the mood of a landscape such as Goethe describes it, is lacking. Taine does not see nature as an artist, who allows it to work and impress itself upon him, but he sees it in the eyes of a scientist who desires to reproduce every sign accurately; his descriptions are not the end in view, but the means to an end. According to Wetz, he has gone too far in attempting to explain all by the salient quality; yet, his study of Shakspeare is one of the profoundest ever written, p. 158. In his analysis of Droz' article, to most of which the writer has had no access, Wetz points out three influences that Droz mentions: Stendhal; Hegel, Comte, Mill; Balzac and Renan. The first influence has been treated more thoroughly by Droz than by any other critic, and yet Wetz thinks that this must be the subject of a separate and exhaustive study; he suggests a number of subjects for special study, such as, the relation of Taine and Stendhal; Taine, Mérimée and Flaubert; Hegel's influence;

Planat and Woepke. According to Wetz, Margerie, Barzellotti, and Droz failed to differentiate clearly enough the different *Opérations* that Taine showed in his work of art, literature and history, p. 202. Possibly the most interesting and original part of Wetz' article is his presentation of the influence and relation of Planat, Woepke and Taine. Planat reconstructed social customs according to the theory Taine had adopted; he was a great collector of engravings, some three hundred thousand which were typical of a custom, etc.; Woepke was an Oriental scholar, with a thorough knowledge of Sanskrit, Greek, Arabic and Persian mathematics; these three men exchanged ideas. This is an entirely new subject in the study. Wetz' article is the most stimulating and encouraging for a comparative study of Taine's critics that we have, suggesting quite a variety of subjects for special study, among which a comparative analysis of the differences of opinion of critics on various points would be exceedingly interesting and valuable, such as Taine's style, before and after his travels, (change from the abstract to the concrete); the reliability of his statements; opinions on his English Literature; reason of the hostility of some critics. Wetz' article would form a fine basis for such studies.

Faguet's article in the *Revue de Paris*, 15 July, 1 August, 1899, is the most important written by him, and is of especial interest from the fact that he seems to take a new departure in confining himself almost exclusively to pointing out the defects and combatting the theories of Taine; it treats of Taine the moralist and the effect of this method, in this respect, upon his writings. It has been published in *Polit. et Moral. au xix. Siècle*, iii, 1900. One of the most interesting parts, and one in which Faguet seems to have failed, is his attempt to apply Taine's theory of salient quality to himself, and this he finds to be *La Probité*. The first objection is to his theory of salient quality, a result of collecting, grouping and classifying facts; we thus know man only by the sensation, elaborated by abstraction; he is reduced to a certain quantity of matter governed by inflexible laws; the inner spirit is not taken into account because what is invisible we do not know. Faguet

discusses the pessimistic idea of Taine on man; the question whether literature is the expression of society, showing that it is often not the case, therefore, leading to errors in date and to wrong conclusions. He concludes from this that the object of Taine was precisely that which excluded his method; his method ought to have led him to study everything except that which he took for his object; that is, great writers only.

Taine is wrong, says the critic, in applying the psychology of the people to the individual as this effaces the individuals and makes them common. His system is in vain because it attempts to struggle with the infinite complexity of human nature. M. Faguet maintains that Taine's idea of the world determines all his work; his literary studies are problems, the solution of which is given in advance, as books in which the conclusion is not reached from research, but researches that are derived from conclusions.

These are some of the many objections and criticisms in his study, which is simply a mass of ideas, an emanation from a mind operating in very narrow quarters. The salient-quality theory of Taine, as applied to M. Faguet, most admirably explains his writings. He is possessed of a most powerful interior vision, reflection or apperceptive power, but lacks the perceptive ability or exterior vision entirely. M. Faguet could be given a subject and undoubtedly would be able to argue to and fro on either side and be convincing on both; such is his power of concentrative coördination. He never deviates from his path, therefore does not see the broader perspective of events and facts as Taine perceives it. This article, as everything M. Faguet has written, is highly suggestive and useful.

M. Faguet leaves a somewhat modified impression of Taine in his article in Petit de Julleville's *Histoire*, etc., viii, pp. 381-397, 1900, which, in the main, covers the same ground as the preceding; however, the spirit of it seems to be more conservative and less hostile. In it we have an explanation of Taine's so-called pessimism and misanthropy; an exquisite soul of courtesy, amiability, diligence and delicacy; timid, reserved, a superior man who lived to reason; he knew but little how to

make men amiable by showing himself sympathetic to them. As a critic he was really an inventor; his attempt to make of literary criticism a precise science, which will always fail, was singularly honorable.

After combatting Taine's theory of the salient quality and that literature is the expression of society, he concludes that he will be placed along side of Comte and Renan, or perhaps a little below these.

In his history of French Literature, ii, pp. 401-406, 1900, M. Faguet makes statements which, when considered with the preceding, will not present a consistent portrait. Taine was a positivist in the sense that he refused man the faculty of knowing anything except through observation; he was especially a critic, and more occupied in stopping others on the brink of rashness than in constructing a hazardous system himself; a logician-critic rather than an artist-critic. His method is the most impossible. His style is a heroic effort of will, but successful; however, one feels the beauty of the effort more than the beauty of success. Throughout M. Faguet lauds Taine, but in a final sentence he offsets what he has said in praise, showing that he is not a deep admirer of Taine. His final verdict is that posterity will find nearly all in his books that has been thought in philosophy, in literature, in morals, in politics by the thinkers from 1860-1885.

The article of Seignobos, *L'Œuvre Litt. de Taine*, in Petit de Julleville's *Histoire*, etc., viii, pp. 267-279, is interesting from the historical side. Taine is severely criticized; 1. for not giving extensive and accurate bibliography; 2. for not working on authoritative documents; 3. for not controlling the documents he uses. To read these dozen pages leaves the impression that Taine and his work in history are zero, false, inaccurate, unscientific; his work is a historical monument already half ruined; the architect, ignorant of the profession of the mason, did not know how to choose solid materials; this article is the severest ever written in denunciation of Taine, the historian.

M. Brunetière is one of the first French critics rightly to interpret and appreciate Taine's system and his work. His first articles in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1885, 1887, deal

with his method almost exclusively, and in these he severely criticized him on account of his system, which two things are often confounded. Not until 1889, in his review of Pellissier's *Mouvement Littéraire*, does he interpret Taine's system. Without Taine the movement that took place between 1855-1879, would hardly have been possible; one would not have understood the movement of a Dumas and Flaubert without the *Essais de Crit.* and *Hist. Litt. Angl.* His one article on Racine's tragedy revived the literary history of the seventeenth century; one article definitely interpreted Balzac. His theory has reduced to a minimum the part of the author in his work; and his role or function he has reduced to a mediator between nature and the public. A drama of Shakespeare is the expression, or testimony, of the conception that the Anglo-Saxon of the sixteenth century had of the world and life, etc. This brings his theory together with that of impersonality in art. In his *Evol. des Gen.*, M. Brunetière has possibly better analyzed the position, bearing, influence and signification of Taine in the evolution of French literature, criticism and literature in general, in the history of the ideas and art of his time, than any other one critic. The present writer believes that M. Brunetière was one of the very few critics, until the recent Taine revival, who foresaw his greatness and future influence. In his *Disc. de Combat, L'Art et la Morale*, p. 71, 1898, he sums up Taine's aim thus:

"Ce qu'il a cherché pendant trente ans ce sont des moyens de ramener, de réduire à l'unité de la certitude ce que l'on croirait, à première vue, que les opinions littéraires comportent de diversité légitime;—qu'il faut disputer des goûts."

There are classifications in natural history; Taine wanted to show that there are in literary history, in morals, in æsthetics, scales of values and means of determining them. Subordination of characters, balancing of organs, natural selection are scientific principles; his aim was to show that there are moral, æsthetic and philosophical principles as well as scientific principles. Herein lies the unity of his intellectual life and the guaranty of the perpetuation of it. In connecting the moral and natural sciences he tried to make the former

share in the certainty or probability of the latter. Taine's aim and system have never been better defined than in this presentation. In estimating the value of the two Taine critics who have written more than any others, MM. Brunetière and Faguet, it might be stated that the former's criticisms are entirely constructive, helpful to an appreciation of his system, importance and signification in the development of literary criticism; while those of the latter are mostly destructive, very helpful to the student seeking the attackable points, exceedingly suggestive of ideas, somewhat inconsistent and not always acceptable.

Giraud, *Essai sur Taine*, 1901, the latest and most complete work, is the first to apply Taine's own system to himself successfully. From the literary standpoint and for the Taine-student it is invaluable. The first part deals with Taine and his work, pp. 1-157; the second gives his bibliography in chronological order (published and unpublished works), pp. 161-207, with a bibliography on Taine as nearly complete as this can be, pp. 209-219; the third part contains extracts of sixty unpublished articles, pp. 221-283; the fourth part, extracts of various articles on Taine, pp. 289-306.

M. Giraud first shows that Taine's native province, the Ardennes, was so near Germany as to have influenced his development; some of Taine's principal traits are German, p. 4. He traces the philosophical mind and love for art and beauty through the whole Taine family-tree; he pictures the state of mind of the youth of 1840-1850, under the influence of science; Taine went through a religious crisis, probably longer and more painful than that of Renan, from which he concludes that in him there is a strain of mystic exaltation, thus differing from M. Faguet and others, who see in Taine a pure positivist without mysticism and any religion, p. 14. The influence of the École Normale is very marked; it was a hot-bed of study, and from it he possibly gained too much confidence in books, p. 18. The various influences on his different works are discussed in quite an original manner (Beyle, Ste.-Beuve, Spinoza, Hegel, Carlyle, etc.), the effect of his travels, his high morality, discrete stoicism. His courteous but firm independence assured him what Ste.-Beuve never

could obtain; namely, authority, and made him the intellectual conscience of his time, pp. 36-37. M. Giraud denies that Taine was greatly influenced by Comte in his conception of literary history, criticism and philosophy because he did not know and appreciate Comte until 1860-1861, after his work on Mill had been published, p. 44. This critic mentions all the sources of his *English Literature*; Taine, he says, was so bent on his system and so imbued with the idea of it that he failed to see the facts that did not fit in with it; he did not purposely omit them, as nearly every critic maintains; thus, for example, he was so convinced of the superiority of Protestantism over Catholicism that he failed to study and note the Catholic movement in England, p. 46.

M. Giraud adopts M. Lemaître's idea of salient quality—poet-logician—and devotes a chapter to each. The most original and philosophical part of this critic's work is the chapter on the logician, in which he explains in a vastly more trenchant and satisfactory way than any other critic, Taine's conception of the universe and the natural result therefrom of a system of morality. In this Giraud has come infinitely nearer to a profound comprehension of Taine in all his significance than any one before him. Yet, he cannot accept his theories because he bases his argument on Christian spiritualism. This writer explains the fine delineations and the normal parts of Taine's work as emanations of the artist mind rather than as definitions of a psychological critic, p. 72; but in this he seems to fail utterly. He maintains that Taine in classifying works of art according to the degree of importance of the character that they express, departs from the method of the scientist or naturalist, and adopts the view of the moralist; but, here, he overlooks what he has so admirably explained before; his main objection, therefore, which, had he followed his explanation, would not be an objection, is that Taine, as a too faithful scholar of Spinoza and Hegel, tried to weld together moral and physical sciences; here is where his system failed him. According to the present writer, this is where the system came to his aid, and is one of Taine's most original and forceful points. According to Giraud he did not possess the faculty of a poet which lies in imagining

a character, representing it in traits so clear, so happily chosen, so natural that it comes before the reader as real, living. His characters are all abstract beings, a few lines of Michelet painting better than pages of Taine; his imagination is philosophical, one that sets ideas moving and dramatizes abstractions. M. Faguet calls his style a miracle of will, artificial, but M. Giraud disagrees in this, p. 107. His style is purely classical; a tragedy of Racine is not better constructed than a work of Taine; a scholarly, grave form, powerful, organic and living, with large progressive developments, graduated contrasts, play of light and shade—all this makes him one of the great prose writers of French literature, pp. 111-112. Taine is a great poet by virtue of penetrating the sense of nature, by the instinctive need of drawing from her images and symbols, by virtue of his classical art of coördinating and developing them, p. 120.

As to his influence, Giraud concludes from statistics that Taine has been read and studied by his contemporaries, he has reached the most diversified public and won the most varied readers. Nearly all great writers acknowledge their indebtedness to him, and his influence is probably as great outside of France as within his native land. He shows that Ste.-Beuve, in his later period, was gradually persuaded by Taine of the importance of the psychological interest of works over the mere anecdotal; this is his greatest victory over the generation of 1830. They next hailed him as their chief; yet, many of the realistic works were already written when Taine became famous. His influence on the novelists Zola, Maupassant, Fabre, Pouillon; on the historians Lavis, Hanotaux, Sorel, Chuquet; on the critics Brunetière, Faguet, de Vogüé, is very marked. In political and social questions they seem to rival him, to complete and correct and finish his work, p. 144. On Bourget Taine seems to have put the seal or impression of his thought more than on any of his other contemporaries, p. 145. G. Paris, Gebhardt, Sully Prudhomme, Boutmy, Hennequin, Doumic, Lanson, Texte, Barrès and many others show his influence.

As an educator in teaching the *ensemble* of knowledge, where observation and experi-

mentation had brought it in 1870, Taine is incomparable. We owe to him the renewing of literary criticism, physiological psychology, philosophical studies, in a more scientific and substantial sense, the sociological tendency of the present time. M. Faguet says for twenty years he has exercised in France the influence that Spencer had in England. In conclusion M. Giraud observes that the most difficult of his theories to admit is his conception of science; the critic attempts to show that the term science ought to be reserved for the positive sciences, and that science must not attempt to found a morality. In the domain of psychology and history, art, sociology and philosophy positive methods are fundamentally inefficient, and Taine's philosophy is a striking proof of this; in the moral and religious order experimental and deductive methods no longer have their right; his work in this respect is defective, but the personality and the man himself is superior to his work, for in it he has put his incomparable sincerity, which makes us pardon his grave errors. This last part of the critic's work is disappointing in proportion as the work, in general, is satisfactory. Giraud here departs from the views of a broad and liberal thinker and settles upon biased tendencies. In all domains of research, be it in psychology or in ethics, physiology or religion, the principles of Taine's system are being applied more and more, and can be supplied without infringing upon the domain of religion.

The works of Giraud and Barzellotti have been reviewed by Doumic in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1st of April, 1901, an article which notes the principal points of interest brought out in these two books. It may be worth mentioning that Doumic declares that every man who writes in France to-day owes something to Taine; it is even yet difficult to judge his work in the *ensemble*, as his influence is still too strong and active.

Conclusion: From the present Taine bibliography we gain an almost complete, definite appreciation, if not exact knowledge, of the significance, nature and bearing of his work on literary history. And now, if Mahrenholtz is correct in his assertion that it remains for a German critic broadly to interpret Taine, this is the appropriate time for the German "Aufklärungsartikel" to be written.

Speaking from an unprejudiced point of view, it can safely be said that no other writer in constructive literature as opposed to imaginative literature (novel, poetry, etc.) has aroused so much discussion, has so thoroughly penetrated all domains of literature, left his impress upon his own and future generations in such a marked manner, has had such a wide and universal influence, has been read and studied by so many different peoples, has exhibited such a perfectly logical and artistic style, powerful imagination, combined with sound logic and depth of thought; such a wide range of application of a method to such a broad field of material, as H. Taine. In examining the various objections to his doctrine and system and to its results we find: 1. that nearly all issue from biased writers, who, either point out flaws, which are by their very nature too insignificant to detract from the *ensemble*, or judge and condemn him from the standpoint of Christian spiritualism; 2. that on two points depends a just judgment regarding Taine, and the explanation of his work, and that in these critics differ because of the lack of sufficient knowledge of the recent results of science, and secondly because of the attitude they take as to the interrelation of the moral and physical sciences; these two points constitute Taine's own salient characteristics, which must be explained by psychophysiology and his conception of the unity of the universe. From the Taine criticism at hand we are led firmly to believe, that as science progresses, especially the medical (applied psychology and physiology), Taine will gradually come to be ranked as one of the greatest and most original thinkers of the world.

The following works may be added to the almost complete bibliography of Giraud:

Poitou:—Les philos. fr. cont. et leurs systèmes relig., 1864, Charpentier, p. 402.

Grosse, Ernst:—Die Literaturwissenschaft, ihr Ziel u. Weg, Halle, 1887, diss.

Godefroy, Fr.:—Prosateurs Fr. au xix. s., 1870, Gaume Frères, pp. 253-265.

Wetz:—Shakespeare vom Standp. der vergl. Litteraturgesch., 1890, 1897.

Wetz:—Über Litteraturgesch., Worms, Reiss, 1891.



- Mahrenholtz:—H. A. Taine, mort le 5 mars, 1893, *Zts. Spr. Litt.* xv, 2, pp. 141-145, 1893.
- Heigel, Th.:—Taine, *Allgem. Ztg.*, München, 1893, Nos. 345-347.
- Hoffmann:—Taine's Orig. Cont. rev. by Mahrenholtz, *Zs. Spr. Litt.* xvi, pp. 74-81, 1894.
- Weigand:—Das Elend der Kritik, München, Lukasche Buchhdl., 1895, pp. 35-101.
- Wetz:—Litteraturwissenschaft, in *Krit. Jahrb.* Rom. Phil. i, pp. 157-192, 1895.
- Aftalion, Abbé:—Les theories pol. de T. Giard et Brière; Extr. *Rev. Internat. de Sociologie*, 1896, pp. 22.
- Morello, V.:—Tre critici: Taine, Carlyle, De Sanctis, *Revista politica e letteraria*, 1899, No. 2.
- Dutoit:—Die Theorie des Milieu, Bern, 1899, diss.
- Doumic, R.:—H. Taine, in *Rev. Deux Mondes*, 1901, April 1st.
- Menéndez y Pelayo:—Obras Compl. iv, Madrid.
- Lévy-Bruhl:—La philosophie de Comte, cf. Introd. on Taine, Alcan.

#### STATISTICS ON TAINE BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- From 1850-59, eighteen articles,  
 1860-69, thirty-nine "  
 1870-79, forty-five "  
 1880-89, forty-three "  
 1890-99, one hundred and forty-two articles,  
 1900-01, nineteen articles.

In 1893, the year of Taine's death, about forty-four articles appeared; since his death, one hundred and forty articles have appeared. More than fifty articles have been published without name or date.

Total number of articles and books, more than three hundred and sixty.

HUGO P. THIEME.

University of Michigan.

#### NOTES ON THE LIFE AND POEMS OF ANNA MARGARETHA PFEFFER.

IN Goedeke's *Grundriss*, vol. iii, p. 329, may be found in the list of female writers of religious poems in the eighteenth century the

name of Anna Margaretha Pfefferin *née* Spechtin. In addition to the name, Goedeke gives the following note concerning her: "Frau des Generalsuperintendenten Pfeffer in Seesen, geb. 1689, als Poetin gekrönt 1739, gestorben 1742."

This is all that is known concerning a woman, who like many others of her time, imbued with the spirit of religious fervor, poured forth the aspiration, the longings and the doubts of her heart in lyric form. Acquiring no doubt considerable celebrity as a poetess, among her friends and acquaintances of the little town of Seesen, her fame spreads beyond the confines of the town and of the duchy of Brunswick and she is induced to make a collection of her poems and submit them to Prof. Ch. A. Heumann in Göttingen for approval. The result of this attempt, which was made in 1734, we do not know directly but can surmise from the fact, that a few years later, according to Goedeke, she was crowned as a poetess. Where Goedeke obtained this information I have been unable to discover. The manuscript of her poems, which do not seem even to have been printed, passed over from the library of the Gymnasium, where Prof. Heumann, perhaps, had deposited it, to that of the University of Göttingen upon the founding of the latter. It was there that Goedeke became acquainted with the poems and hence the mention of the authoress in his *Grundriss*.

As to the personality and life of the writer, I have succeeded after some little search in adding somewhat to the meagre information given by Goedeke. He tells us that her maiden name was Specht and that she was the wife of the general superintendent of Seesen. From a short sketch of the life of her husband, written by her oldest son and printed together with the funeral sermon preached at the funeral of the said Pfeffer by Caspar Andreas Pfortner, we learn that she was the oldest daughter of Christian Specht, a famous churchman of the time, who had held successively the position of *Prediger* of the Kreuzkirche in Hanover, of *Consistorialrath*, *Hofprediger* and *Superintendent* at Eutin, *Oberhofprediger* at the court of the duke of Brunswick at Wolfenbüttel and finally of Abbot of the rich monastery of Riddagshausen, not far from the town of Brun-